SUBJECTS.

came to be levied. He explained the various versions of its origin and said that none of them connected the cess with Rajabhogam. The fact that the cess was levied on all properties, even on *Pandarapattom* lands, showed further that it was not allied to Rajabhogam, but that it was an extra or *piravagai* cess. In these circumstances, he requested that the cess might not be treated as Rajabhogam and converted into one-eighth of the assessment at the Settlement.

Mr. Raman Tampi (Member, Eraniel Taluk) spoke in support of the request.

Dewan's reply.—Noted. The matter will be enquired into.

[*Note*.—It has since been decided that *chatham* should be treated as an extra cess and not as Rajabhogam in the Taluks of Kalkulam and Eraniel.]

18. Improvement and conservation of Irrigation works.

Mr. Padmanabha Pillai (Member, Eraniel Taluk) spoke on the necessity for improving the irrigation tanks. In the Eraniel Taluk alone, he said there were over 900 tanks, but they had in course of time silted up owing to want of timely repairs; and the water that might collect in them during the rainy season was hardly sufficient even for one crop. He requested that the tanks might be conserved and the channels, culverts and bridges connected with them might be maintained in good condition.

Mr. K. Appadura Aiyer (Member, Nedumangad Taluk) urged the necessity for an organized system of irrigation.

19. Abolition of Adiyara for Adoption.

Dewan's reply.—Will be noted for consideration.

Mr. M. Madhavan Tampi also requested that the practice of levying *Adiyara* in cases of adoption in Marumakkathayom families might be abolished. The levy of the fee pressed hard on the people, while it did not bring any large income to the Sirkar. He observed that the enquiry in regard to the valuation of properties for fixing the *Adiyara* gave much scope for abuse. After all, when the property was valued, the *Adiyara* determined and the matter laid before His Highness the Maha Rajah, His Highness, out of kindness, often commanded the remission of the *Adiyara*. As a matter of fact, the *Adiyara* was realised in very few cases. In the course of ten years, there were 23 adoptions and the fee realised did not come to Rs. 2,000. He then referred to the Royal Proclamation of 1063 M. E. which abolished the *Adiyara* in cases of inheritance of the property of *Koottukars* dying without direct heirs and prayed for an extension of the principle embodied therein. He urged that the levying of the fee alone should be stopped, but that the privilege of receiving the *Neet* of adoption should be continued.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly